DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 120 926 EA 008 070

AUTHOR King, Royce
TITLE Development of an Administrator's Guide for School District Self-Evaluation.
PUB DATE 2 Feb 76
NOTE 42p.; A related document is EA 008 071. Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for Doctor of Education, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); *Administrator Guides; Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Measurement Techniques; *School Districts; School Systems; *Self Evaluation; State Standards
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this practicum was to develop, field test, implement, and evaluate a school district self-evaluation guide specifically designed for Texas schools. The need for such a guide was expressed by school officials faced with the challenge of meeting and maintaining state minimum accreditation standards. The guide was developed and used in one multicampus district to conduct a self-study. Revisions to the instrument were made throughout the duration of the practicum effort, with the Texas Education Agency's accreditation staff giving its approval for the guide to be used in self-evaluation studies throughout the state. Eight districts within Region XIII received approval to use the guide during the current school year. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED120926

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EA TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

JAN 29 1976

DEVELOPMENT OF AN ADMINISTRATOR'S GUIDE FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT SELF-EVALUATION

by Royce King

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, Nova University

Austin Cluster
George Bowden
Coordinator

Maxi II Practicum Report
February 2, 1976

Outside Observers:

Mr. William Johnson, Superintendent
Hays Consolidated Independent School District
Box 368
Kyle, Texas 78640 Phone: (512) 268-2141

Dr. David Gillmore, Director of Planning and Evaluation
Education Service Center, Region XIII
6504 Tracor Lane
Austin, Texas 78721 Phone: (512) 926-8080

Dr. Milton Smith, Associate Professor
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666 Phone: (512) 245-2158

EA 008 070

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT.	i
INTRODUCTION.	ii
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.	3
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.	4
CONDUCTING THE PRACTICUM.	13
EVALUATION.	19
CONCLUSIONS	29
APPENDICES.	31

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this practicum was to develop, field test, implement, and evaluate a school district self-evaluation guide specifically designed for Texas schools. The need for such a guide was expressed by school officials faced with the challenge of meeting and maintaining state minimum accreditation standards. The guide was developed and used in one multi-campus district to conduct a self-study. Revisions to the instrument were made throughout the duration of the practicum effort, with the Texas Education Agency's Accreditation Staff giving its approval for the guide to be used in self-evaluation studies throughout the state. Eight districts within Region XIII received approval to use the guide during the current school year.

INTRODUCTION

This practicum was undertaken in response to requests from regional superintendents for assistance in conducting district self-evaluation studies. Generally these requests came as a result of an impending accreditation visit by the State Department of Education (Texas Education Agency) staff. Most superintendents felt that the Evaluative Criteria were too voluminous and time-consuming for their limited staffs to use for self-evaluations in small and medium sized school districts. This practicum participant decided to develop a self-evaluation instrument utilizing the Texas Education Agency accreditation bulletin as the basic outline for the guide.

The initial step in the practicum was a review of the professional literature to determine if similar guides or documents had been developed that might be helpful in the development of the guide. After the review of literature was completed, an area superintendent was contacted to determine if he and members of his staff would participate in a series of study sessions to assist the writer in determining the content and format for the self-evaluation guide. The superintendent also agreed that his district would use the guide in conducting a district self-study.

On completion of the initial draft of the guide, copies were submitted to the school district personnel and Texas Education Agency accreditation staff to critique. Based upon their suggestions, the guide was revised and expanded. Following the revisions the Texas Education Agency accreditation staff agreed to approve the use of the guide by any district requesting Texas Education Agency's permission.

The Administrator's Guide for School District Self-Evaluation was used as the basis for a self-study by the Hays Consolidated Independent School District during the 1975-76 school year. The study was initiated with the central office and building administrators during July, and the total faculty became involved during a three-day work session in August conducted by this participant. Five staff development days throughout the fall semester were devoted to the self-evaluation by the majority of the teaching staff, with central administrators devoting additional time to the study.

Each of the district personnel was requested to evaluate those portions of the guide upon which he/she worked. In addition to these evaluation data, the superintendent, board members, and Texas Education Agency accreditation staff were asked to evaluate the usefulness and efficiency of the guide.

Initially only eight school districts within Region XIII were notified of the availability of the guide for use during the 1975-76 school year; however, requests for copies have been received from throughout the state. Since the Texas Education Agency has approved the guide, this participant plans to make it available to all 60 Region XIII schools, and to provide multiple copies to each of the other nineteen (19) regional service centers in the state.

The participant believes this practicum to have been a valuable experience -- one that will have significant affect on the accreditation/self-evaluation process and cause significant improvements to occur in the educational programs of Texas' schools.

THE PROBLEM

> Each local school system in Texas, through its own initiative, determines whether or not it wants to be accredited by the State Department of Education. When it decides to become accredited, it automatically accepts the responsibility of meeting at least the minimum standards prescribed for accreditation. The initial responsibility, therefore, for meeting the standards for accreditation rests with the local school officials. Consequently, self-evaluation is the first step in the evaluative process. Each accredited school system shall establish and maintain in its own way a system of self-evaluation.[1]

The Education Service Center receives several requests each year from area superintendents for assistance in conducting district self-evaluation studies. Many of these requests come as a result of an impending accreditation visit by the Texas Education Agency staff. Of the 1,135 public school districts in Texas, only 53 are presently unaccredited, therefore most district administrators are not concerned with self-evaluation as a vehicle to become accredited rather to maintain their accreditation status.

The Education Service Center staff has never been able to assist local districts in their self-evaluation efforts, except to suggest they use the Evaluative Criteria developed by the National Study of School Evaluation or to study the Texas Education Agency Bulletin 560, Principles and Standards for Accrediting Elementary and Secondary Schools. Most superintendents,

---

[1]Principles and Standards for Accrediting Elementary and Secondary Schools, Bulletin 560, rev., Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, October, 1974, p. 44.

especially those from smaller school districts, indicate that the sheer volume of the Evaluative Criteria is overwhelming to them and their staffs, and that the Texas Education Agency accreditation bulletin is not explicit enough for use as a self-evaluation guide.

The need is quite obvious for a support agency, such as an education service center, to develop a comprehensive guide specifically for Texas administrators to use in conducting district-wide self-evaluation studies. The problem of the Education Service Center and of this practicum was to develop a practical self-evaluation guide for Texas districts utilizing the Texas Education Agency accreditation bulletin as the basis for the guide, to select one multi-campus district to pilot the program, and to evaluate the usefulness of the guide by having personnel from the pilot school and Texas Education Agency accreditation staff rate the various sections of the guide according to criteria established during the practicum.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this practicum were to develop a self-evaluation guide especially designed for Texas school districts to examine their educational programs according to the Principles and Standards for Accrediting Elementary and Secondary Schools; to pilot test, revise, and evaluate the guide; and to have it approved by the Texas Education Agency accreditation staff for use throughout the state.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The intent of the literature review is to determine if similar evaluation guides have been developed that would assist the writer in the preparation of the self-evaluation instrument. The review is not intended as a complete study of school accreditation and self-evaluation. However, the writer feels that it is important to review the developmental stages of school accreditation and school self-evaluation prior to the review of current self-evaluation instruments.

Developmental Stages of Accreditation and Self-Evaluation Activities

Accreditation and self-evaluation as means for educational improvement began about 1870. According to Douglas (2: 575-589) the University of Michigan began a policy of accepting only students from schools that had been inspected and placed on a list of approved/accredited secondary schools. The University of Chicago began a similar procedure about 25 years later. The action of those two institutions likely influenced the development of the regional accrediting associations. Through the next 25 years these associations began the visiting team concept of school accreditation that is still prominent today.

Manlove (10: 233-237) indicated that the first meeting of the six regional accrediting associations was held in 1933. At this meeting the associations adopted the name "Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards." This group developed the initial guidelines for school evaluation and the concept of self-evaluation evolved.

In the early 1940's the guidelines, entitled "Evaluative Criteria," were first published and made available to secondary schools for their use in self-evaluation. The Evaluative Criteria manual has been revised approximately every ten years since its inception and in recent years has been divided into three volumes and expanded to include elementary and middle school levels, as well as the secondary grades.

The importance of self-evaluation was emphasized by Jessen (9: 219-225) in 1955. Jessen, a former chairman of the Cooperative Study of Secondary-School Standards, stated that the greatest value to be gained from an evaluation came as a result of the self-evaluation portions of the study in which the faculty and community were involved. Numerous other articles in the literature strongly support the position that self-study is a valuable means for improving educational programs. Schilson (15: 259-262) identified improvements that come as a result of critical self-analysis are those which occur in the areas of administration, curriculum, methodology, faculty morale, pupil-teacher-parent relations, and research.

Morphet et al (12: 531-554) suggested that participation by board members, as well as by staff members, was a desirable method for contributing to school improvement. The authors viewed school appraisal as an inevitable process and suggested that one or two percent of a school's budget be dedicated to this purpose.

Manlove (10: 233-237) emphasized the importance of careful planning and provision of sufficient time for self-evaluation efforts to avoid unnecessary negativism on the part of faculty members. Manlove agreed with other writers that some of the bene-

fits of self-evaluation include helping teachers to analyze and improve themselves, stimulating teachers to improve instruction through experimentation, creating an esprit de corps among the staff and administration, and increasing knowledge of the over-all school program.

Douglas (3: 69-71) suggested that the evaluation process should be repeated at least once every seven years. Wiltse (17: 102-104) agreed that the evaluation process should be repeated on a regular basis, with the interval being four to five years.

Romine (14: 142-143) indicated need for reassessment of the philosophy and program of accreditation. The author suggested that much of the inspectorial and policing services now rendered might well be abandoned or modified, especially by regional agencies. He contended there is much unnecessary and unfruitful duplication of effort between state and regional accreditation agencies. No one set of requirements can serve well the diversity of secondary schools and their associated conditions across the nation, stated Romine. Small districts have special needs which are quite different from the large major city systems. Romine also stated the need for a higher level of funding for accreditation and self-evaluation.

A study of Holliman (7: 79-87) found that almost 98 percent of the schools in his sample used the Evaluative Criteria as their self-evaluation instrument. The author found that over 91 percent of the schools conducted their self-evaluations primarily for the purpose of gaining or maintaining accreditation status. His research concurred with other studies that both principals and teachers believed the self-evaluation process to be very meaningful

in bringing about improvements in the educational program of their schools.

Scriven (16: 159-167) is highly critical of the regional accrediting process. He states that it is a good example of poor evaluation. Scriven adds that the Evaluative Criteria offers no place for criticizing institutional goals in terms of the needs of the community served which is often the most important and constructive type of evaluation. He further offers that most accreditation is amateurish and self-sustaining for the accrediting agencies.

The vast majority of the literature places greater value on the self-evaluation process for purpose of educational improvement than for the accreditation function. Based upon this assumption, it seems imperative that the educational community seek means for improving the self-evaluation procedures to make them more meaningful for the school districts which use them.

Review of Current Self-Evaluation Documents

Principles and Standards for Accrediting Elementary and Secondary Schools (13) developed by the Accreditation Division of Texas Education Agency is the official document which presents the principles and standards by which Texas schools are accredited. This document is not presented in a format that lends itself for use in self-assessment effort; however, it will serve as a major source of information for the development of the Administrator's Guide for School District Self-Evaluation.

The Evaluative Criteria (4) developed by the National Study of Secondary School Standards has exerted more influence on the nature of public school evaluation than all other documents combined. The Evaluative Criteria until recent years has been the only available instrument for schools to use in their self-analyses. However, in its governing board's attempt to be all things to all schools, and to attempt to address all states' principles and standards, the instrument has become too voluminous and overwhelming for most schools to attempt to use it. This is especially true of small rural districts, where the superintendent has no central office staff to assist him in coordinating a district self-study. Districts which have substantial central office staffs can certainly use the Evaluative Criteria in the manner it is designed.

An Instrument for Evaluation and Inservice Training for the Elementary School (1) developed by Educational Consultant Services presents a means through which nine major areas of the elementary school program may be rated by teachers. Objective criteria are presented on the various facets of the program and are divided into three categories: superior school program; an above average school program; and a minimum school program. Teachers' ratings are tabulated for each of the nine areas of the instrument and from the teacher responses, the areas most urgently in need of improvement can be identified. The instrument calls for the teacher evaluation teams to develop plans for inservice training programs to meet those needs identified in the self-study program. One page of the document is devoted to a summary statement of the Texas Education Agency's Principles and Standards for Accrediting Elementary Schools.

The Measure of a Good School-A Guide to Evaluation of School Systems, Adapted Particularly for Use in Kentucky School Districts (11) was developed in 1964 by the College of Education at the University of Kentucky. This guide addresses six areas of the educational program to be evaluated. Those areas are (1) instructional program, (2) staff, (3) administration, (4) finance, (5) school plants, and (6) transportation. The guide was developed by the Bureau of School Service at the University of Kentucky to assist school districts to meet and maintain the standards set by the Kentucky State Board of Education. The document is primarily a fill-in-the-blank exercise without any consistency in format or provision for summarizing strengths, weaknesses, or plans for improvement. This guide would be inappropriate for use in Texas schools.

The Elementary School Evaluation Kit: Needs Assessment (5) is a recent development of the Center for the Study of Evaluation. This kit was designed to aid curriculum planners in determining the goals of their school or district in terms of their own views and those of parents, teachers, and community members. The needs statements are clearly presented in an easy-to-use format, and the developers claim to have extensively field-tested the materials.

The kit appears to be a sound procedure for involving the community in the needs assessment portion of a self-evaluation.

General Goals and Purposes of Independent School District 191 (6) developed and adopted by the Burnsville, Minnesota board of education is one in a series of papers developed by the district to clarify and strengthen various facets of the educational program. This paper and one entitled Developing Specific Objectives present excellent examples on the progression of objectives--from

state goals to individual student objectives. These or similar papers would be very helpful in assisting faculties with self-evaluation programs.

Instructional Objectives Exchange (8) a project of the Center for the Study of Evaluation has developed and collected the most extensive lists of instructional objectives available in the country. The purpose of the Exchange is to provide teachers and administrators a source from which to select prepared measurable objectives rather than having to completely formulate their own. Four basic elements are included for each objective in the Exchange collections -- (1) the objective, (2) measurement items, (3) means of judging the adequacy of student responses, (4) an IOX rating. The Exchange project is a continuing effort which will serve as an excellent source for well formulated objectives to assist schools involved in school self-improvement programs.

Any school district undertaking a self-evaluation has numerous sources for securing assistance for conducting needs assessment and for developing goals and instructional objectives; however, for the district requiring a comprehensive guide for self-evaluation, the Evaluative Criteria and the guide proposed in this practicum appear to be the only choices.

Bibliography

1. Carmichael, William R., Genevieve G. Alford, and Jack Williams, An Instrument for Evaluation and Inservice Training for the Elementary School, Huntsville, Texas: Educational Consultant Services, 1970.

2. Douglas, Harl R., Modern Administration of Secondary Schools, Boston: Ginn and Company, 1954, pp. 575-589.

3. Douglas, Harl R., "Evaluating and Accrediting Junior High Schools," The Teachers College Journal, 34, November, 1962, pp. 69-71.

4. Evaluative Criteria, 4th ed., Washington, D.C. National Study of School Evaluation, 1969.

5. Elementary School Evaluation Kit: Needs Assessment, developed by Center for the Study of Evaluation, U.C.L.A. Graduate School of Education, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

6. General Goals and Purposes of Independent School District 191, Burnsville, Minnesota, September, 1973.

7. Holliman, Billy C., Educational Improvements Resulting from School Self-Evaluation as Reported by Selected Principals in Texas, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Commerce, Texas: East Texas State University, November, 1969, pp. 79-87.

8. Instructional Objectives Exchange, Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, U.C.L.A. Graduate School of Education, 1966.

9. Jessen, Carl A., "Cooperative Study of Secondary-School Standards After Twenty-One Years," The North Central Association Quarterly, 30, October, 1955, pp. 219-225.

10. Manlove, Donald C., "Self-Evaluation and Visitation for all Member Schools," The North Central Association Quarterly, 39, Winter, 1965, pp. 233-237.

11. Measure of a Good School: A Guide to Evaluation of School Systems-Adapted Particularly for use in Kentucky Schools, Lexington, Kentucky: Bureau of School Service, College of Education, 1964.

12. Morphet, Adgar L. et al. Educational Organization and Administration, Englewood Cliff, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1967, pp. 531-554.

13. Principles and Standards for Accrediting Elementary and Secondary Schools, Bulletin 560, rev., Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, October, 1974.

14. Romine, Stephen, "Accreditation: A Basic Step Toward Educational Improvement," National Association of Secondary School Principals, 55, May, 1971, pp. 142-143.

15. Schilson, Donald L., "School Self-Study: Purpose, Initiation, and Functions," The Clearing House, 40, January, 1966, pp. 259-262.

16. Scriven, Michael, Evaluation: A Study Guide for Educational Administrators, Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University Press, 1974, pp. 159-163.

17. Wiltse, Norris G., "How May a Program of Self-Evaluation be Organized and Administered?," National Association of Secondary School Principals, 39, April, 1955, pp. 102-104.

CONDUCTING THE PRACTICUM

All major efforts related to this practicum were performed by the author. A graduate intern assisted for two weeks on the development of the initial draft of the self-evaluation guide, and a staff editor reviewed the document for grammatical errors. The staff of the Hays Consolidated School District devoted varying numbers of hours to the development and field test efforts of the practicum, with the minimum number being 16 hours which the total teaching faculty of approximately 100 contributed during the August pre-school staff development days.

The initial task of the practicum was to search ERIC and other sources of professional literature to determine if similar guides or documents had been developed in other states. The search, as reflected in that section of the report, revealed that few self-evaluation instruments have been developed in the past ten years. The literature clearly indicated that the majority of schools have used the Evaluative Criteria as the principal guide for conducting self-evaluation studies. Very few ideas for inclusion in a new guide were discovered in the review of the literature.

The next step was to identify a group of educators to obtain their interpretations of the Texas accreditation principles and standards to this author. A total of 5 one-half day study sessions were devoted to this effort. Fifteen individuals participated in one or more of the discussion groups. Participants included two superintendents, four principals, one assistant superintendent for instruction, three teachers, one librarian, two Texas Education Agency accreditation staff members, one graduate intern, and one Region XIII evaluation consultant. The discussion sessions were

structured only by a rough outline of the Texas Education Agency accreditation principles. The study group were asked to "brainstorm" the principles and to make suggestions for topics to be included in a new self-evaluation document. Once the study sessions were underway, the author began developing a format for the guide which would be simple to understand and use, yet comprehensive enough tc elicit from persons completing the various sections thoughtful responses. The "brainstorming" sessions were very helpful in formulating content for the guide.

Following the study sessions several weeks were devoted to the development of the initial draft of the self-evaluation instrument. On completion of the draft, the review team was gathered to critique the document. One of the accreditation staff members took the original draft to the Texas Education Agency for review by the total accreditation staff. Within a month the draft was returned to the author from the Texas Education Agency with five recommendations for additions to the guide. Those recommendations were: (1) To develop a form to secure a brief history of the district, (2) To expand the community information section in order to obtain more data, (3) To expand the student data section to secure information on the district's testing programs, test results, and graduate follow-up information, (4) To develop additional forms for securing information on all aspects of the instructional program -- the strengths, weaknesses, needs, and means for improvement, and (5) To develop a facilities survey form to gather data on each building in the district.

With the recommended additions developed and incorporated into the guide, the Texas Education Agency Accreditation Division gave its approval on the self-evaluation instrument for any Texas district to use which requests Texas Education Agency permission. All school districts within Region XIII which had been advised to conduct self-evaluation studies during the 1975-76 school year were notified by the author of the availability of the guide and the need for the Texas Education Agency's approval for its use. Eight districts, including Hays Consolidated School District -- the field test site, have requested to use the guide in their self-evaluations. The author has assisted most of those districts in organizing their staffs to conduct the studies.

The Hays School District superintendent received the consent of his board of education for the district to work with the author in field testing the guide. The district encompasses three rural communities with five separate campuses distributed within them. Each of the communities has an elementary school, with a middle school and high school located in the geographic center of the district. Approximately 1,800 students are enrolled in the district with a professional staff of 120 members. This appeared to be an ideal setting for field testing the guide.

The author met with the administrative staff of the Hays District in July to develop the initial plans for conducting the self-evaluation. At that planning session the superintendent appointed the assistant superintendent for instruction to serve as the self-evaluation coordinator. A steering committee composed of 14 teachers, administrators, students, and lay citizens was appointed to provide leadership for the study. Each of the

members of the steering committee was asked to serve as either a chairperson or co-chairperson of a task force to address the 11 major sections of the self-evaluation guide. Each of these task force leaders was given the opportunity to select other personnel from the district to work on the various task forces.

In early August the author met with the administration and the steering committee members. At that meeting the committee members identified the members of their task force groups. A project schedule was developed and adopted. The largest task force group was the one assigned to work on the curriculum and instructional portions of the study. It was decided that all teaching staff should be involved for a minimum of two days during the August pre-school workshop. On August 13 the author met with members of the curriculum and instruction task force to discuss the purposes of self-evaluation and to review those portions of the guide with which they would be working.

The task force on district history, philosophy, and district goals completed its initial draft of these documents prior to the pre-school workshop in late August. The author and two colleagues from the Education Service Center worked with the entire faculty of the district for two days in late August on the curriculum and instruction areas of the study. The two days were devoted to formulation of program and course goals that were compatible with the district goals which were developed earlier. Many of the subject matter groups were able to move beyond the program and course goals and began developing instructional objectives, activities, and evaluation procedures which was the ultimate goal for the curriculum and instruction task force.

Each member of the steering committee was given the responsibility and authority to call his/her task force together as frequently as was needed to complete the work assignments prior to their scheduled deadlines. Most of the groups agreed that their self-evaluation efforts could be completed in November or December. The author developed a procedural form (Appendix A) to assist the administration and steering committee in scheduling various tasks to be done. The author continued working with various district personnel as a consultant/facilitator during the fall semester. Five full days were devoted to work with the Hays School District during the fall school term.

As each task force completed its work assignment on the study, members of that group were asked to complete an evaluation form on those sections of the guide on which they worked. Task force members were given a copy of the Participant Evaluation Profile (Appendix B) and requested to rate only those sections of the self-evaluation guide on which they worked. The profile form requested that each of the 11 principle and standards sections be rated on a 1 to 5 scale on the criteria of relevance, importance, scope, credibility, timeliness, and pervasiveness. A second evaluation document (Appendix C) was developed to gather data on the criterion of efficiency from the district superintendent, board members, and Texas Education Agency accreditation staff members. Data gathered from these evaluation devices will be presented in detail in the evaluation portion of this report.

All efforts by the 11 task force groups were completed and submitted to the steering committee by mid-December. The steering committee completed its work on the study prior to the Christmas

holiday break. Evaluation activities were completed in early January, 1976.

After the evaluation was conducted, it was decided that no further revision was required in the self-evaluation guide until new principles, standards, and procedures are developed in the accreditation process by the Texas Education Agency.

Copies of the guide were disseminated to all superintendents (60) within Region XIII and to the directors of the other 19 regional service centers in the state.

EVALUATION

Three major objectives were established to be accomplished by this practicum. The objectives and evaluation procedures follow.

(1) Objective - To develop an administrator's guide for school district self-evaluation studies utilizing the Texas Education Agency Bulletin 560 as the basis for the guide.

Evaluation - This objective was accomplished as evidenced by (1) a guide was developed through a series of study sessions with a group of local school district personnel, (2) the guide was reviewed by members of the Texas Education Agency's accreditation staff and revisions were made according to their recommendations, (3) the Texas Education Agency accreditation staff approved the use of the guide by the eight districts within Region XIII which were required to conduct self-studies during the current school year, (4) two of the eight districts have completed self-studies using the guide from August through December; the other six will complete their studies during the spring term, (5) other information to substantiate the accomplishment of this objective will be given under objectives two and three.

(2) Objective - To assist one district in conducting a self-evaluation study using the guide.

Evaluation - A total of 96 district personnel completed the Participant Evaluation Profile (Appendix B) when they concluded their work on the study. The personnel involved in the evaluation included 80 teachers, seven administrators, two board members, three lay citizens,

two students, and two maintenance persons. The evaluation profile gave the personnel an opportunity to rate those sections of the guide on which they worked on the criteria of relevance, importance, scope, credibility, timeliness, and pervasiveness on a 1 to 5 scale.

The tables that follow reveal how the eleven sections of the guide were rated on the criteria listed above.

Table 1

Relevance Criterion

Were the purposes of this section of the guide clear and meaningful to you?

SECTIONS OF THE GUIDE	N	SCALE LOW 1	2	3	4	HIGH 5
1. Community & Student Data	(23)			3.77		
2. Constitutional Provisions	(4)				4.75	
3. School Board Functions	(5)				4.40	
4. Board/Administration	(9)				4.11	
5. Administrative Regulations	(9)				4.22	
6. Instructional Program	(79)			3.68		
7. Personnel	(8)				4.12	
8. Methodology/Resources	(24)			3.75		
9. Classroom Units	(9)			3.44		
10. Facilities	(6)				4.17	
11. Total School Program	(10)				4.10	
AVERAGE RATING					3.84	

A total of 186 ratings were made on the criterion of relevance. Of those responses five percent rated the guide a two rating in terms of clarity and meaningfulness; 28 percent of the ratings were average three ratings; the other 67 percent rated the relevance criterion with either a four or five rating. The average rating of 3.84 by the 186 responses indicated that the purposes of the guide were clear and meaningful to at least 67 percent of those completing the evaluation form.

Table 2

Importance Criterion

How important was this section of the guide in terms of program improvement?

SECTIONS OF THE GUIDE	N	SCALE LOW 1	2	3	4	HIGH 5
1. Community & Student Data	(23)			3.39		
2. Constitutional Provisions	(4)				4.75	
3. School Board Functions	(5)				4.60	
4. Board/Administration	(9)				4.22	
5. Administrative Regulations	(9)				4.11	
6. Instructional Program	(79)			3.68		
7. Personnel	(8)			3.75		
8. Methodology/Resources	(24)			3.75		
9. Classroom Units	(9)			3.33		
10. Facilities	(6)				4.17	
11. Total School Program	(10)				4.00	
AVERAGE RATING					3.77	

Three percent of the responses rated the guide with a low rating of one or two on the criterion of importance. An additional 32 percent rated this criterion with an average three rating. Sixty-five percent of the ratings were fours or fives, with the average rating for importance being 3.77. This rating indicated that the personnel felt that all sections of the guide were important in addressing district program improvement.

Table 3

Scope Criterion

Was the scope of this study broad enough to look at the relevant and significant elements of your school?

SECTIONS OF THE GUIDE	N	SCALE LOW 1 2 3 4 HIGH 5
1. Community & Student Data	(23)	3.52
2. Constitutional Provisions	(4)	4.25
3. School Board Functions	(5)	4.20
4. Board/Administration	(9)	3.44
5. Administrative Regulations	(9)	3.56
6. Instructional Program	(79)	3.69
7. Personnel	(8)	4.13
8. Methodology/Resources	(24)	3.80
9. Classroom Units	(9)	3.67
10. Facilities	(6)	4.00
11. Total School Program	(10)	4.00
AVERAGE RATING		3.74

The respondents were not as positive to the criterion of scope as the previous two criteria. Items one, four, and five had average ratings of less than 3.60. This might imply that additional attention should be given those sections to assure that they are broad enough to look at all significant and relevant aspects of the school.

Table 4

Credibility Criterion

Were your responses based upon valid, reliable, objective data?

SECTIONS OF THE GUIDE	N	SCALE LOW 1	2	3	4	HIGH 5
1. Community & Student Data	(23)			3.65		
2. Constitutional Provisions	(4)					5.00
3. School Board Functions	(5)				4.60	
4. Board/Administration	(9)				4.22	
5. Administrative Regulations	(9)				4.22	
6. Instructional Program	(79)			4.03		
7. Personnel	(8)				4.50	
8. Methodology/Resources	(24)				4.25	
9. Classroom Units	(9)				4.11	
10. Facilities	(6)				4.50	
11. Total School Program	(10)				4.30	
AVERAGE RATING					4.12	

The average rating of 4.12 on the criterion of credibility indicated that the respondents felt that they had valid, reliable, and objective data in completing various sections of the guide. Item one with a rating of 3.65 was the only one of the eleven sections with an average rating of less than 4.00.

Table 5

Timeliness Criterion

Were the purposes of the study timely for you and for the school?

SECTIONS OF THE GUIDE	N	SCALE LOW 1	2	3	4	HIGH 5
1. Community & Student Data	(23)			3.78		
2. Constitutional Provisions	(4)				4.50	
3. School Board Functions	(5)				4.00	
4. Board/Administration	(9)			3.78		
5. Administrative Regulations	(9)			3.78		
6. Instructional Program	(79)			3.47		
7. Personnel	(8)			3.88		
8. Methodology/Resources	(24)			3.58		
9. Classroom Units	(9)			3.67		
10. Facilities	(6)			3.83		
11. Total School Program	(10)			3.80		
AVERAGE RATING				3.65		

Less than four percent of the respondents rated the criterion of timeliness under a rating of three. Thirty-eight percent gave this criterion an average rating of three, with the remaining 58 percent rating the timeliness criterion above average. This was the lowest rated criterion on the evaluation profile which was an appropriate rating in terms of the importance of the other criteria.

Table 6

Pervasiveness Criterion

Can the findings of this study be readily acted upon to improve the school?

SECTIONS OF THE GUIDE	N	SCALE LOW 1 2 3 4 HIGH 5
1. Community & Student Data	(23)	3.48
2. Constitutional Provisions	(4)	4.00
3. School Board Functions	(5)	3.80
4. Board/Administration	(9)	3.44
5. Administrative Regulations	(9)	3.44
6. Instructional Program	(79)	3.23
7. Personnel	(8)	3.88
8. Methodology/Resources	(24)	3.42
9. Classroom Units	(9)	3.22
10. Facilities	(6)	3.67
11. Total School Program	(10)	3.50
AVERAGE RATING		3.72

The respondents felt that the findings of the study could be acted upon to improve the school as evidenced by the average rating of 3.72. However, 42 percent of the ratings on this criterion were on section six (the instructional program) and those respondents were not as optimistic (3.23 rating) that the findings could or would be acted upon to improve the program.

It can be reasonably concluded that the self-evaluation guide adequately met the criteria as reflected in the preceding tables.

(3) Objective - To evaluate the usefulness of the guide by having personnel from the participating district and the Texas Education Agency accreditation staff rate the guide according to the practical criteria used in objective two and the prudential criterion of efficiency.

Evaluation - The author met with the superintendent of the Hays School District at the conclusion of the self-study to collect the information on the upper portion of the efficiency criterion profile form (Appendix C). After this information was gathered it was shared with the Hays administrative staff, board of education, and members of the Texas Education Agency accreditation staff. These groups were asked to study the data presented on the efficiency profile form and then respond to the five statements at the bottom of the form to react to the factors of time, cost, personnel and usefulness. In addition the Texas Education Agency staff members were asked to review the findings shown in Tables 1-6 to determine if the Texas Education Agency concurred with the district personnel in their rating of the practical criteria.

A group of nine school personnel, two board members, and two Texas Education Agency accreditation staff members responded to five items at the bottom of the efficiency profile (Appendix C).

The average ratings of their responses are shown on the form. It can be concluded from the data and the responses that the self-evaluation was conducted very economically and the guide was useful for the purpose of the study. Only .665 percent of the total school budget of $2,615,554 was devoted through personnel and other minor costs to the effort. The average ratings of 4.00 and 3.80 on the last two items indicated a high level of satisfaction with the guide and a high level of comparability with other self-evaluation instruments. The Texas Education Agency director of accreditation concluded in a recent conversation with the statement that the State Department of Education is most interested in overall educational improvement as a result of self-evaluation regardless of the kind of guide or procedure used in the process. . . if school officials are more comfortable using The Administrator's Guide for School District Self-Evaluation instead of the Evaluative Criteria or other instruments, those officials would be approved to use the guide. This is the basic philosophy this participant has espoused in assisting the Hays School District in conducting their study.

CONCLUSIONS

This practicum provided this participant an opportunity to work closely with a large portion of a school district staff in conducting a comprehensive self-evaluation. The practicum also addressed an acknowledged need of the Texas Education Agency accreditation staff -- a practical guide for Texas schools to use for self-studies.

The basic conclusions derived from this practicum are:

- Teachers and administrators will give their time freely and cooperatively if the purpose and importance of a task such as a self-evaluation are clearly defined.
- A practical guide has been developed based upon the Texas principles and standards for school accreditation as reflected in the evaluation results. The guide can be readily modified to any new principles or standards, or to any new procedures that may occur in the accreditation process.
- The guide was formatted in such a manner that it was relatively easy to summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the district by using the self-assessment profile and the district planning forms found on pages 110-111 of the instrument.
- Evaluation forms (Appendices B and C) were developed that utilized both practical and prudential criteria. Similar evaluation profiles can be used effectively in a variety of evaluation efforts.
- A comprehensive self-study can be conducted in a small district (100 member instructional staff) for less than one percent of their total budget.

. This practicum experience has been an excellent professional growth opportunity for this participant, and has provided an experiential base from which continuing services can be offered to local schools.

APPENDIX A
SUGGESTED PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATION

	BEGINNING DATE	ESTIMATED TIME TO COMPLETE
-- Organize for Self-Evaluation		
1. Orient board and receive approval	_____	_____
2. Appoint a self-evaluation coordinator	_____	_____
3. Order or select materials for self-evaluation	_____	_____
4. Orient administration	_____	_____
5. Select and organize steering committee	_____	_____
6. Assign staff to various task force groups	_____	_____
7. Orient entire staff	_____	_____
8. Develop project schedule	_____	_____
9. Orient students and community	_____	_____
-- Complete Philosophy, History, and Goals Section of Self-Evaluation		
1. Develop philosophy and receive board approval	_____	_____
2. Develop district history	_____	_____
3. Review State Goals	_____	_____
4. Develop District Goals involving staff, students, and community and receive board approval	_____	_____
5. Disseminate philosophy, history, and goals to all members of task force groups, students and community	_____	_____
-- Complete Principles and Standards Section of Self-Evaluation		
1. Principle I -- Community and Student Data	_____	_____
2. Principle II -- Constitutional and Statutory Provisions	_____	_____
3. Principle III -- Board Functions	_____	_____
4. Principle IV -- Board-Administration Relations	_____	_____
5. Principle V -- Administrative Regulations	_____	_____

	BEGINNING DATE	ESTIMATED TIME TO COMPLETE
6. Principle VI -- Instructional Program		
a. Instructional Program Descriptions		
b. Program Goal, Objectives, Activities & Evaluation Sections		
7. Principle VII -- Personnel		
8. Principle VIII -- Teaching Methodology and Resources		
9. Principle IX -- Classroom Units		
10. Principle X -- School Facilities		
a. Facilities Survey Forms		
11. Principle XI -- Total Program		
-- Complete All Sections of Self-Evaluation		
1. Monitor work of task force groups		
2. Provide assistance to task force groups		
3. Collect results in prescribed format		
4. Itemize identified problems or weaknesses from each Principle Section on District Planning Form		
5. Chart district standard ratings on District Self-Assessment Profile		
-- Analyze Results of Self-Evaluation		
1. Compare findings with district goals		
2. Develop activities to address identified problems and weaknesses		
3. Develop a time sequence to complete activities		
4. Estimate costs for completing activities		
5. Adoption of improvement plans by board		
6. Evaluation of the self-evaluation process		
7. Dissemination of results of self-evaluation to community, staff, students, and the Division of Accreditation of the Texas Education Agency		

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION PROFILE ON THE SCHOOL SELF-EVALUATION STUDY

INSTRUCTIONS: YOU HAVE COMPLETED YOUR WORK ON THE SELF EVALUATION STUDY OF YOUR SCHOOL. YOU ARE REQUESTED TO RESPON. TO THI.. DOCUMENT TO EVALUATE THOSE PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS IN THE STUDY ON WHICH YOU WORKED. PLEASE RATE EACH OF THE 11 STATE PRINCIPLES ON WHICH YOU WORKED DURING THIS STUDY ON A 1 TO 5 SCALE (1 low, 5 high) ON EACH OF THE SIX CRITERIA BELOW. PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR RESPONSES.

CHECK YOUR POSITION TEACHER__, STUDENT__, ADMINISTRATOR__, BOARD MEMBER__, CITIZEN__	RELEVANCE-WERE THE PURPOSES OF THIS SECTION CLEAR AND MEANINGFUL TO YOU	IMPORTANCE-HOW IMPORTANT WAS THIS SECTION IN TERMS OF PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	SCOPE-WAS THE SCOPE OF THIS STUDY BROAD ENOUGH TO LOOK AT THE RELEVANT AND SIGNIFICANT ELEMENTS OF YOUR SCHOOL	CREDIBILITY-WERE YOUR RESPONSES BASED ON VALID, RELIABLE, OBJECTIVE DATA	TIMELINESS-WERE THE PURPOSES OF STUDY TIMELY FOR YOU AND FOR THE SCHOOL	PERVASIVENESS-CAN THE FINDINGS OF THIS STUDY BE READILY ACTED UPON TO IMPROVE THE SCHOOL
PRINCIPLE AND STANDARDS PLEASE RESPOND TO ONLY THOSE SECTIONS OF THE GUIDE ON WHICH YOU WORKED	1 2 3 4 5 LOW HIGH	1 2 3 4 5 LOW HIGH	1 2 3 4 5 LOW HIGH	1 2 3 4 5 LOW HIGH	1 2 3 4 5 LOW HIGH	1 2 3 4 5 LOW HIGH
1. History, Philosophy Community, Student Data	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Constitutional & Statutory	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Board Functions	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Board/Administration	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Administrative Regs.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Instructional Program	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Personnel	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
8. Methodology Resources	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. Classroom Units	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. School Facilities	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
11. Total Program	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION PROFILE ON THE SCHOOL SELF EVALUATION STUDY EFFICIENCY CRITERION

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM WITH THE MOST ACCURATE DATA AVAILABLE: THE SUPERINTENDENT OR HIS DESIGNEE SHOULD COMPILE INFORMATION ABOVE THE DOTTED LINE. THE BOTTOM PORTION OF THIS FORM PROVIDES AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE SUPERINTENDENT, BOARD MEMBERS, TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY ACCREDITATION PERSONNEL, AND OTHER INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS TO EVALUATE THE EFFICIENCY OF THE STUDY AND THE GUIDE.

. APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL HAVING PARTICIPATED IN THIS STUDY		96
. PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PERSONNEL THE FIGURE ABOVE REPRESENTS		80 %
. APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF MAN DAYS DEVOTED TO THIS TOTAL EFFORT		275
. APPROXIMATE DAILY SALARY AVERAGE OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL		$ 60.67
	*TOTAL PERSONNEL	$16,684.25
. TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTITUTES REQUIRED TO RELEASE PARTICIPATING TEACHERS		-0-
. DISTRICT SUBSTITUTE PAY RATE		$ 20.
	*TOTAL RELEASED TIME COSTS	$ -0-
. OUTSIDE CONSULTANT COSTS	*CONSULTANT(S)	$ -0-
. SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS	*SUPPLIES/MATS.	$ 200.
. MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES	*MISC. EXPENSES	$ 250.
	*TOTAL COST	$17,134.25

. THE TOTAL COST FIGURE REPRESENTS .665 % OF THE TOTAL ANNUAL DISTRICT BUDGET

	NUMBER							
. THE PERSONNEL TIME DEVOTED TO THIS STUDY WAS (PERSONNEL INVOLVEMENT)	(13)	LITTLE VALUE TO THE DISTRICT 1	2	AVERAGE VALUE 3	4	GREAT VALUE TO THE DISTRICT 5	AVERAGE RATING	(4.08)
. THE PERSONNEL TIME DEVOTED TO THIS STUDY WAS (AMOUNT OF TIME)	(13)	TOO LITTLE 1	2	ABOUT RIGHT 3	4	TOO MUCH 5		(2.92)
. THE TOTAL COST FOR THE SELF-STUDY	(13)	CANNOT BE JUSTIFIED 1	2	JUSTIFIABLE 3	4	WELL JUSTIFIED 5		(3.77)
. THE ADMINISTRATOR'S GUIDE FOR SCHOOL DISTRICT SELF EVALUATION WAS	(13)	UNSATISFACTORY FOR THIS STUDY 1	2	SATISFACTORY 3	4	HIGHLY SATISFACTORY 5		(4.00)
. COMPARED TO OTHER EVALUATION GUIDES PREVIOUSLY USED THIS GUIDE WAS	(10)	LESS THAN COMPARABLE 1	2	COMPARABLE 3	4	HIGHLY COMPARABLE 5		(3.80)

APPENDIX D

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: The Superintendent Addressed

FROM: Royce King, Director of Program Development

DATE: January 8, 1976

SUBJECT: Administrator's Guide for School District Self-Evaluation

Enclosed is a copy of a self-evaluation guide that I have developed during the past year. As you will note, the guide is patterned after the TEA Bulletin 560, Principles and Standards for Accrediting Elementary and Secondary Schools. The office of school accreditation of TEA has granted permission to several of our Region XIII schools to use this guide during the current school year for conducting their self-evaluation studies.

If you have any questions concerning the guide or its use, please contact me.

Enclosure

RK/mib

APPENDIX E

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: The Executive Director Addressed

FROM: Royce King, Director of Program Development

DATE: January 8, 1976

SUBJECT: Administrator's Guide for School District Self-Evaluation

Enclosed is a copy of a self-evaluation guide that I have developed during the past year. As you will note, the guide is patterned after the TEA Bulletin 560, Principles and Standards for Accrediting Elementary and Secondary Schools. The office of school accreditation of the Texas Education Agency has granted permission to several districts within this region to use this guide during the current school year for conducting their self-evaluation studies.

Please feel free to duplicate and disseminate copies of the instrument to any districts within your region. If I may answer questions concerning our work with the guide with Region XIII districts, do not hesitate to contact me.

Enclosure

RK/mib